



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

over a contraction of protoplasm. It is one of the ultimate facts of the universe. When Prof. Baldwin admits that an animal can select which of two muscles it will use, or when he admits that an animal can contract any muscle under the stimulus of "pleasure, pain, etc., he admits this ultimate fact, but does not explain it.

As to the scope of Social Heredity as a factor in psychic evolution, it appears to me to be, like that of the higher intelligence, mainly restricted to the higher animals and to man. Maternal instruction among all but the higher animals probably has no existence. Imitation may be supposed to be possible to animals a little lower in the scale. But both factors are to my mind only supplementary to the more vigorous education furnished by the environment, with its wealth of stimuli to "pleasure, pain, experience, association, etc." In regarding Social Heredity as the sole factor of psychic evolution, Prof. Baldwin temporarily loses sight of the intimate connection between mind and its physical basis. The inheritance of mental characteristics is as much a fact as the inheritance of physical structure, and for the reason that the two propositions are identical. One does not believe in either education or imitation as a cause of the repetition of insanity in family lines. We rather believe in a defective brain mechanism, which is inheritable, though fortunately not always inherited. The doctrine of Weismann that acquired characters are not inherited, if true, would furnish the physical conditions for the theory that Social Heredity is the only psychic heredity, but it is impossible to believe that Weismann's doctrine is true. Hence while Social Heredity is true as far as it goes, Lamarkism is also true, and expresses the more fundamental law. The fact that no adequate physical explanation of the inheritance of acquired characters has been reached does not disprove the fact.

E. D. COPE.

---

## ANTHROPOLOGY.<sup>1</sup>

**Indian habitation in the Eastern United States.**—Mr. Thomas Wilson of the Smithsonian Institution in a recent letter referring to a discussion in Washington as to the shape of Indian habitations east of the Mississippi, says, that while certain of the disputants "agreed that the Plains Indians of the present or modern times used wigwams made with poles fastened together at the top and spreading out in a circle at the bottom after the fashion of a Sibley tent, they

<sup>1</sup>This department is edited by Henry C. Mercer, University of Penna., Phila.

denied that any such structures were used by Indians, in the East. They insisted that these wigwams were confined to the plains and to the prairies and treeless countries, and did not exist, or were not found, and had never been used in the timbered countries—that in the timbered country Indian houses were made of wooden logs with upright sides and a flat or sloping roof. While I knew that many of these were made among the Iroquois of the East, and that this form was adopted in making the long houses (as they were called), I doubted whether they were so built among the nomadic and wandering tribes of Pennsylvania and the West Ohio, Indiana, etc. Can you give me any enlightenment thereon? If so, I will be obliged.”

While it is not improbable that the shape of “wigwams,” like burial customs varied considerably among the forest Indians, and while any camper out feels that a shelter often temporary, framed in the woods with available boughs, would vary in shape according to circumstances and suggest variation in more permanent structures, no one need hope to speak with final authority upon this subject, who has not ransacked the records of explorers, the narratives of individuals captured by Indians, the *relations* of the Jesuits, and the significant sketches of travellers in the last two centuries.

Dr. Daniel G. Brinton informs me that certain of the Brazilian forest Indians use the tepee form, and speaking of the Lenni Lenape, and quoting Nelson’s History of New Jersey, writes: “William Penn describes the dwellings of the Delaware Indians as ‘houses of mats, or barks of trees, set on poles, hardly higher than a man.’ Pastorius states that ‘young trees would be bent towards a common centre and the branches interlaced and fastened together as a frame work, and covered with bark.’ Wassaenaer says, ‘they would construct a circular matted hut, with either angular or rounded top, thatched or lined with mats, a rent hole in the top serving for the escape of smoke.’ This last description is strictly that of a tepee and shows that the angular pointed hut was in use by the Mohigan and Lenape Indians. Wassaenaers’ History is printed in Vol. III New York Documentary History.”

The above quotation from Penn, however, if given correctly in Watsons’ Annals of Philadelphia Vol. II. p., 153 reads distinctly against the tepee form. “Their houses were made of mats or barks of trees set on poles, *in the fashion of an English barn*, but out of the power of the winds for they are hardly higher than a man.” And we find a rectangular structure again ascribed to the work of a band of Lenapes squatting in the suburbs of Philadelphia about 1770-80, in

Watson Vol. II. p. 31 where a person 80 years old in 1842 relates that he well remembers seeing colonies of Indians of twenty or thirty persons, often coming through the town (Germantown) and sitting down in Logan's woods, others in the present (1842) open field south-east of Griggs' place. They would make their huts and stay a whole year at a time and make and sell baskets, ladles and tolerably good fiddles. He has seen them shoot birds and young squirrels there with their bows and arrows. Their huts were made of four upright saplings with crotch limbs at top. The sides and tops were of cedar bushes and branches. In these they lived in the severest winters. Their fire was on the ground and in the middle of the area."

As the barn structure with its ridge pole would take six upright crotched saplings, this rectangle set up by half civilized indians with only four, was not barn shaped but single sloped like the simplest form of shed. The form described above by Pastorius judging from the tendency of elastic saplings when pulled together at the top to bow outward, would probably have resulted in a round roofed structure of the bee hive pattern if round at the base, or if rectangular, in such a building as De Brys' picture made in 1690 refers to Virginia Indians (Contributions to N. A. ethnology Vol. IV) or Captain John Smith carefully draws over the head of the sitting Powhatan in the upper left hand corner of his map of Virginia (see Narr. and Critical History of Am., III, 166.) But if we believe Wassenauer who distinctly describes the Sioux Tepee we must allow the latter form to the Delawares.

Too much importance need not be ascribed to the minute realistic outlines of habitations made to stand for Indian villages upon certain old maps drawn on a large scale as for instance in Dumont de Montigny's map of Louisiana (1746), when all Indian villages are marked with tepee like points from the Illinois River to New Orleans and from the Mobile to the Mississippi Rivers. On the other hand Du Prats, in a similar map (1758) gives the barn shape.<sup>2</sup> In other maps the structures seem too carefully and designedly drawn to be without archæological value. As when Father Abrahams Almanac Map 1761 (Narrative and Crit. Hist. V, 497) marks seven indian towns in the tepee shape near the junction of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, and Hennepin in his map (1740) of the Mississippi valley and lakes (Narr. and Crit. Hist. IV 252 and 249) and again in his map of the lake region (1683) clearly shows pointed wigwams about the head waters of the Mississippi, as against small rectangular figures for the lower valley. Hawkins describes a communal Indian house seen in Florida as

<sup>2</sup> Narrative and Critical History of America Vol. V. p. 66.

like a great barn in strength, not inferior to ours. Lescarbot's map of Montreal 1609. (Narr. and Crit. His. IV 304) shows the palisaded Indian village of Hochelaga with barn-shaped round-roofed rectangular structures as in John Smith's cut, and in a map of Lake Ontario and the Iroquois Country 1662-63, (from one of the Jesuit *relations*) the indian villages are barn-shaped and with pointed roofs. La Hontan suggests the same shape in his map of the lake region 1709 (Narr. Crit. Hist. IV 281-261-258) and several Indian lodges of the circular bee-hive pattern surrounded by cultivated enclosures are given by Champlain in his map of Plymouth Harbor 1605. (Narr. and Crit. History IV 109). While not only the round bee-hive pattern, but also the long rectangle with round roof, as in Smith, are carefully drawn by the same explorer in his map of Nauset Harbor, 1604-05 (Land fall of Leif Erickson by Eben Norton Horsford p. 78).

More interesting is the direct evidence of the Indians themselves. The Lenape Stone, found in the Lenape region in 1872, and whose authenticity after ten years observation I have been unable to doubt, shows three pointed figures near trees, unmistakably referring to tepee shaped habitations in the right of the drawing, and another figure similarly outlined on the reverse, (See the Lenape Stone or the Indian and the Mammoth by H. C. Mercer, Putnam, N. Y. 1885). Another stone figured by me from the same locality. (See Lenape Stone p. 94) seems again to be inscribed with three tepee like forms.

No less explicit is the tepee figure upon the so called Winnipeseogee Stone found on the shores of Lake Winnipeseogee. (See Abbotts' Primitive Industry p. 362). George Copway (See Bureau of Ethnology Report 1888-89 p. 493 and 242) shows us Ojibway drawings which doubtless refer to the same pointed form of habitation.

That the sides of the barn shaped structures when built as by the Iroquois were invariably made of logs, is not to be supposed from the statement above quoted from Wm. Penn., and the drawing by Captain John Smith. All things considered, we have reason for supposing, subject to correction from documentary investigation, that though the barn shaped and round roofed rectangular structures were common, not only the bee hive, but the true tepee form were in use by Indians in the Pre-Columbian forest east of the Mississippi.

HENRY C. MERCER.